



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

or less primitive among them is, therefore, delusive. (3) The connection of the Last Supper with the passover in Mark and the reference to the new covenant point to an intended parallel between the two rites, and the perpetuation of the one as of the other. (4) That Jesus' words must have been intelligible, and that, therefore, the sense in which they were universally taken is right. (5) That Luke, 1:1-4, professed to follow tradition, whereas the omission of 22:19b, 20 would make him impugn tradition, and that these verses are demanded by the context.

Evidently, the question between the longer and the shorter form of Luke is the most important question raised. Probably Westcott and Hort were right in omitting the verses from their point of view. But since then, the brilliant and probable suggestion that the peculiar readings of codex D were taken from the Logia removes the necessity for supposing that the shortened form is original in Luke, but leaves the question in a still more interesting shape. It becomes now a question between the two synoptical sources, between Mark and the Logia. But the strong point in the argument against this critical doubt is the fact of the celebration from the beginning, showing in what sense our Lord's words were taken by the apostles. It is undeniably strong. But the assumption that Jesus' words are to be taken in the sense attached to them by the early disciples does not always hold good. One of the proofs of the historicity of the gospels is that they have reported the words of Jesus, even where they tell against themselves, and their report has been decisive against their interpretation.

But, after all, the main question in regard to the place of the memorial rite in the worship of the church is answered by its own fitness and beauty.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DAS KINDHEITSEVANGELIUM NACH LUCAS UND MATTHAEUS, unter Herbeiziehung der ausserkanonischen Paralleltex te quellenkritisch untersucht. Von ALFRED RESCH. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897. Pp. iv + 335. M. 6.50.

THIS is the fifth part of the author's collection of extra-canonical parallel texts to the gospels which he has published since 1893. It treats of the gospel of the infancy, which he regards as being in close connection with John's prologue. From the preface we learn that thirty-three years ago the author entered upon his duties as evangelical

preacher in the same congregation in which he still is. In the course of this period he has thirty-three times preached the Christmas gospel with joyfulness and a certainty which no literary inquiry could take from him; otherwise he would not have retained the courage to continue in his office. After these preliminary remarks Resch plunges *in medias res*, and, having mentioned those New Testament writers who have treated the gospel of the infancy (namely Matt., chaps. 1, 2; Luke, chaps. 1, 2) separately, he states that, from the very beginning, the history of the infancy of Jesus did not belong to the public preaching of the gospel, which generally commenced with the ministry of the Baptist and the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. This we see from the second of the canonical gospels, and the main tenor of the narrative in Matthew begins with chap. 3:1, and so likewise in Luke with 3:1. The prologue in John (John 1:1-18), which is a theological meditation on the gospel of the infancy — like the history of the infancy in the first and third gospels — forms a part by itself, independent of the main body of the gospel. The author's thesis is this: "The pre-canonical gospel of the infancy was a family history published under the title ספר חולדות ישוע משיח, originally composed in Hebrew, afterwards translated into Greek, arranged after the pattern of the book of Ruth with a genealogy, containing a continuous narrative of the history of the birth and infancy of Jesus; from this the first evangelist made excerpts for his purposes, the third evangelist made use of it in other parts, the fourth evangelist made it the object of his thoughtful meditation contained in the prologue; it was known to Justin in an extra-canonical recension, and was directly or indirectly influential in the apocryphal gospels of the infancy." Dividing the gospel of the infancy into seventeen pericopes — I, the annunciation of the birth of John (Luke 1:5-25); II, the annunciation of the birth of Jesus (vss. 26-38); III, Mary's visit to Elizabeth (vss. 39-56); IV, birth of John, circumcision, and youth (vss. 57-80); V, betrothal of Mary (Matt. 1:18-25^a); VI, birth of Jesus (Luke 2:1-20; Matt. 1:25^b); VII, circumcision of Jesus (Luke 2:21; Matt. 1:25^c); VIII, presentation in the temple (Luke 2:22-24); IX, Simeon (vss. 25-35); X, Anna (vss. 36-38); XI, the wise men from the East (Matt. 2:1-12); XII, the flight into Egypt (vss. 13-15); XIII, infanticide at Bethlehem (vss. 16-18); XIV, return from Egypt (vss. 19-22^a); XV, residence at Nazareth (Luke 2:39, 40; Matt. 2:22^b, 23); XVI, Jesus twelve years old in the temple at Jerusalem (Luke 2:41-52); XVII, genealogy of Jesus (3:23-38; Matt. 1:1-17) — Resch takes up the several

points mentioned in his thesis, and discusses each minutely. He not only examines the language of the original documents, but also gives as the result of his examination a Hebrew and Greek text of the gospel of the infancy. His citation of extra-canonical passages shows a more than usual acquaintance with patristic literature, and what he says of the relation of the original document to the gospel literature (*i. e.*, canonical and apocryphal), of its influence upon the apostolic didactic teachers, and of its after-effects upon extra-canonical writers, and finally of its influence upon the oldest confession of the church, is of the highest interest and very instructive. The result is, according to Resch, that the **ספר תולדות ישוע המשיח** was early translated into Greek as *Bίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, influenced the Pauline Christology, was known and perused by the author of the apocalypse. As to the author of the **תולדות ישוע**, Resch says that, if we could assume that it originated from notes or, at least, from communications of Mary, everything would be clear. At any rate, these family papers were published after the death of Mary; and if we assume that this book was deposited in the episcopal library at Pella-Jerusalem along with other important documents of the apostolic church, we can easily understand how the first and third evangelists could make use of the book. All these suppositions are closely related to one another and offer a satisfactory solution of the literary mystery in reference to the gospel of the infancy, to him that believes in the birth of Jesus *ἐκ παρθένου*. The *παρθενογένεια* was an esoteric mystery during the lifetime of Mary. Nowhere is it said that the shepherds, or Simeon, or Anna, or anyone else, knew anything of it. During the lifetime of Mary Jesus was regarded as the legitimate son of Joseph. But it is evident that as soon as the gospel of the infancy became known, the first and third evangelists employed it in their gospels, and that John also on the basis of it stated that Jesus was born *οὐκ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ*. But John, the foster-son of Mary, would never have made use of the **תולדות ישוע** for his prologue, had he not been convinced of its historicity, and had he not recognized in the mother of Jesus the *παρθένα* of the gospel of the infancy.

It will thus be seen that Resch's view yields a very different result respecting the source and historicity of the infancy narratives from that which recent critical scholarship has been inclined to accept. It is not to be expected that it will be at once accepted. But as an hypothesis to be set over against other hypotheses in a field where, for lack of positive evidence, it is as yet impossible to advance much

beyond hypothesis, it is worthy of consideration. At any rate, Resch deserves the thanks of all scholars for a book full of stimulating suggestions.

B. PICK.

ALBANY, N. Y.

KRITISCH-EXEGETISCHER KOMMENTAR ÜBER DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Von ERICH HAUPT. Begründet von H. A. W. MEYER. *Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897. 7. bzw. 6. Aufl. Pp. vi, 104, 212, 259, 193. M. 6.

THIS is a departure from the Meyer method by which the epistles gathered in this volume were treated separately by different authors. The departure is a gain, both for the author who has thus the privilege of a historical handling of the group, and for the student who thus secures the benefit of a historical impression of their origins and their interrelations. In fact, the historical motive has doubtless controlled the arrangement. It is a motive which is fully justified in the case; for, to say the least, Colossians and Ephesians belong as critically together as 2 Peter and Jude, or the Pastorals.

In this spirit the *Einleitung* for the group is placed at the front of the volume preceding the exegesis of the several letters. We wish it had been placed, not only after the epistles, but after a summarizing of the results of their exegesis, as Bornemann has done in his treatment of the two Thessalonian letters—not that we would imply that such a position would have guaranteed the reader a more thorough study of the epistles, as a basis for the criticism which is placed before him—Haupt is too scholarly a critic to be wanting at such a vital point as this; but it would have been an object-lesson as to the real facts in the case, and would perhaps have influenced the reader to follow the same method in his use of the commentary and in his work with the epistles themselves.

The order of exegetic treatment which Haupt follows is Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians; in the *Einleitung*, however, Philemon is placed first, in order to treat as nearly together as possible the, on the one side, closely connected Philemon and Colossian, and, on the other side, the equally near related Colossian and Ephesian letters. Such an arrangement has its manifest advantages in the handling of the problems involved in the criticism.

In this criticism Paulinity is given to Philemon and Philippians, in